



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

---

## OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET ANALYST REPORT

---

**Date Issued:** September 7, 2011

**IBA Report Number:** 11-51

**Rules Committee Meeting Date:** September 14, 2011

**Item Number:** 1

---

# Response to Grand Jury Report: A New City Hall

On May 23, 2011, the San Diego County Grand Jury filed a report entitled "A NEW CITY HALL: To be, or not to be? That is the question..." This report addresses a citizen complaint regarding the process for evaluation of costs and issues relating to a proposed new San Diego City Hall.


The Grand Jury Report included five findings and six recommendations, which were directed to the City Council. By law, the City Council is required to provide comments on each of the findings and recommendations to the Presiding Judge of the San Diego Superior Court within ninety days. Due to the demands of the City's legislative calendar, the Presiding Judge granted an extension to the date for City Council response to November 1, 2011. Attachment 1 to this report presents the recommended City Council response.

In the past, the Grand Jury has requested responses to their reports pertaining to the City of San Diego from the Mayor's Office alone or from the Mayor's Office and the City Council jointly. When the City Council and Mayor's Office are tasked with responding together, the City's process has been that the Mayor's Office prepares responses, which the IBA reviews. The IBA then recommends to the Council supporting the Mayor's Office responses or making modifications if necessary.


In the case of the New City Hall Grand Jury report, only the City Council is required to respond. Because of the complexity of the issues and staff's in-depth knowledge of the subject matter, it was decided that the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) would draft responses, and the IBA would work with the Mayor's Office to review and make any adjustments deemed necessary for the final recommended Council responses. The responses discussed in Attachment 1 to this report have been reviewed by the IBA, and adjustments have been made in a cooperative effort with the Mayor's Office. The City Attorney's Office has reviewed the responses as well.

In responding to each Grand Jury finding, the City is required to either 1) agree with the finding or 2) disagree wholly or partially with the finding. Responses to Grand Jury recommendations must indicate that the recommendation 1) has been implemented; 2) has not yet been implemented, but will be in the future; 3) requires further analysis; or 4) will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable. Explanations for responses are requested when applicable.

Lastly, in general, past City Council responding reports to the Grand Jury have only been comprised of responses to Grand Jury findings and recommendations. For the New City Hall responding report, the Mayor's Office and the IBA agree that clarification of a number of facts is warranted, due to a number of inaccurate statements made in the Grand Jury report. The clarification of facts is included in the recommended Council response to the Grand Jury (Attachment 1).



Lisa Byrne  
Fiscal & Policy Analyst



APPROVED: Andrea Tevlin  
Independent Budget Analyst

Attachments:

1. Recommended City Council Responses to Findings and Recommendations in San Diego County Grand Jury Report entitled "A NEW CITY HALL: To be, or not to be? That is the question..."
2. San Diego County Grand Jury Report entitled "A NEW CITY HALL: To be, or not to be? That is the question..."